UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Special Announcement!

Coming This Summer—A Series of Four Articles

AN ORDEAL OF FIRE

PEASANT DISTRESS IN INDIA

(Being a detailed explanation of the immediate and remote causes for the renewal of Civil Disobedience in India by the India National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi.)

By G. B. HALSTEAD

(For three years a worker in the Educational and Missionary field in India and who was recently asked by the British Government to leave India because of his sympathy with her cause.)

[UNITY is indebted to the All-World Gandhi Fellowship, John Haynes Holmes, President, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, for the use of these articles, which are the most important yet published in this country.]

ALSO

A FEATURE ARTICLE, summarizing the situation in India at the end of six months since Gandhi's arrest, written by

RICHARD B. GREGG

[An American three years' resident in India, six months at Gandhi's Ashram, now editor of the fortnightly Bulletin published by the American League for India's Freedom.]

READ UNITY FOR FULL REPORTS ON INDIA

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 17

Chicago, June 27, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 259
A World Race—CURTIS W. REESE 261
Jottings—J. H. H. 262

ARTICLES—
Past and Future—*Bernard Shaw* 259
Miss Woolley, Einstein and Ponsonby—SYDNEY STRONG 263
Security and Armaments. I—Is There Security in Armaments? —WILFRED WELLOCK 264
Gandhi at the London Round Table Conference—J. T. SUNDERLAND 266
"The Praying Hands"—ELIOT WHITE 267

POETRY—
Unharvested Wheat—FANIA KRUGER 265

THE STUDY TABLE—
Convicting the Innocent—ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS 268
Philippine Uncertainty—FREDERICK STARR 270

CORRESPONDENCE—
Depression or Expression—ELEANOR WOOD WHITMAN 270
A Noble Southern School in Extremis—KATHERINE HOMANS, ANNIE F. BROWN, LUCIA AMES MEAD 271

THE FIELD—
Committee of American Women Call on Senator Swanson in Geneva 258
Peace Heroes' Memorial—*Thomas P. Hart* 271
Memorial Day Service at Webster Groves, Mo. 272

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Committee of American Women Call on Senator Swanson, in Geneva

A delegation of American women led by Mrs. Lillian von Matsch of the United States and of Austria and Lola Maverick-Lloyd of Winnetka, Illinois, called on Senator Swanson in the Hotel des Bergues. Among the group were Miss Helena Dudley and Miss Dora Williams of Boston and Miss Mary Lloyd, Mrs. James and Mrs. Reigh Utley of Chicago. They asked the senator to use his influence in the Foreign Relations Committee in favor of the amendment to the World Court Statute which would have the United States enter the Court on condition the future International Code is not based on unequal distinctions in nationality rights between men and women. This, of course, refers to the proposed first article of the World Code drawn up at the Hague in 1930. It was the only article that got through the Codification Conference and was submitted to governments. The United States delegates opposed it but three governments have already ratified, and it needs only seven more ratifications to become law.

Senator Swanson was told that lots of American women would protest when they understood the unequal status proposed for women in international law. Perhaps their mere threat of an amendment to the World Court Treaty will stir up other women and stop the processes of ratification. Women all over the world will be sorry to see the long promised Code of International Law start off wrong. But it will be safer to write a binding reservation into the World Court Treaty, the ladies said.

Senator Swanson said he was so strong for the World Court that he was not willing to delay United States entry by a single reservation. Why should American women worry? They have the right to choose another nationality or keep their own whether married or single.

The ladies explained that there were many cases still of injustice—dual nationality — double taxation, cases involving domicile, inheritance, etc. The senator called it their own fault for marrying foreigners. International marriages were not at all popular with him. Patriotic folks in both countries would be suspicious of such a couple, and in war time they would be considered spies. Anyhow he was sure the proposed article for the World Court could never be applied to an American woman.

The delegation argued that if it was ratified by ten governments it would be international law, and the basis of future World Court decisions unless the dispute involved came up between two countries that had other definite treaty agreements about women's nationality rights. Such treaties are

(*Continued on page 271*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1932 Number 17

PAST AND FUTURE

[*The Romans have set fire to the Library of Alexandria*]

Theodotus:—What is burning there is the memory of mankind.

Caesar:—A shameful memory. Let it burn.

Theodotus (wildly):—Will you destroy the past?

Caesar:—Ay, and build the future with its ruins.

Bernard Shaw, in "Caesar and Cleopatra."

Beginning with its next issue (July 4), UNITY will enter upon its regular bi-weekly schedule for the summer period—July, August, and September. This policy has been adopted frankly in the interests of economy, more than ever necessary in these days when our paper is feeling, as all the rest of us are feeling, the effects of the depression. Most magazines in the summer reduce the size of each issue, often by as much as one-half. UNITY chooses to publish its usual number of pages, and reduce the number of issues, thus meeting most satisfactorily, we believe, for readers as well as editors, the conditions of life during the vacation period. Subscribers desiring to have their expiration dates advanced, so as to include a full 52 issues, may communicate with the publication office.

Before this editorial is printed, Herbert Hoover will have been nominated for his second term as President of the United States. It is our conviction that this is the strongest nomination, all things considered, that the Republican Convention could have made. In saying this, we are not unmindful of Mr. Hoover's weaknesses as a candidate. These are rooted deep in the depression which overwhelmed his administration. For this disaster the President is in no way responsible, yet he will be held such by a stupid and fickle public which knows nothing to do in the hour of disappointment but to hit the fellow who happens to be in office. And it must be conceded that such attack is not wholly unfair in Mr. Hoover's case, in view of his silly talk in the last campaign about Republicanism and prosperity. Furthermore, Mr. Hoover aggravated an inevitable calamity by signing the preposterous tariff bill for reasons utterly unworthy. Also, he was guilty of the incredible folly of stubbornly refusing to recognize the economic collapse even after it was full upon us, and of deliberately deceiving the people with fake promises of recovery just so long as such deception was possible. This makes a rather pitiable record, especially in the case of a man who entered the White House with such an enviable reputation in his pocket. But if all this is true, it is also true that, during the last year, Mr. Hoover has himself made a remarkable recovery. Apparently incapable of leadership, he has suddenly led the way for the entire nation. There has been nothing dramatic, inspiring, or even effective in his policies and actions, but at least he has not been idle, and from the time of his famous moratorium last June has been trying desperately to do something. If it is not his fault that the depression came, it is also not his fault that it has not gone. And in his trial he has gained experience and developed capacity. In a letter to the New York *Times,* Norman Hapgood, an independent Democrat, recently declared that, in the present emergency, the country should elect "Al" Smith as the best qualified man for president; and, failing him, Newton D. Baker. Failing both of these men, said Mr. Hapgood, the country would be wise to retain Herbert Hoover. We agree! As one who will vote for neither of the old party candidates, we would choose Hoover in preference to any man the Democrats are likely to nominate.

We are writing this editorial after several days' reading of the special newspaper despatches describing the opening scenes of the Republican National Convention in Chicago. In the beginning these despatches amused us, they were so silly; in the end they began to disgust us, they were so nauseating. The elaborate descriptions of the noisy crowds in the smoke-laden hotel rooms and corridors, the frank recital of the booze supplies and the drinking parties, the endless detail of bargaining and bribing over this inconsequential point and that, the unblushing display of selfish party interest as superior to any consideration of the nation's need, the pictures of the men dominant in the party's counsels and in the various state delegations, representing as a group the essence of vacuity, vulgarity, venality! The stomach that can stand this, day after day, must be pretty strong. Indeed, we wonder, after the exhibition presented by a convention of this sort, that decent citizens can still be found to sit in such an aggregation of professional

politicians, and millions of them to vote for its candidates. The presidential convention of a great national party ought to represent one of the most sober and solemn events in a great people's life. Its membership ought to include the very flower of the country's brains and character. Its deliberations ought to be conducted with the utmost dignity, and its decisions mark an intelligent and utterly unselfish attempt to solve the pressing problems of the Republic. Was anything of this kind seen in Chicago? We do not want to be unfair, but, unless all the reporting of the Convention was an undisguised slander the grand national assembly of the Republican Party had the seriousness, high purpose and general all-round honesty of a ring-side crowd at a prize-fight crossed with a track-side gang at a horse-race. This Convention and the Democratic Convention are described by some observers as cross-sections of American life. If this be true, then is American life rotten to the core.

Does money talk? Well, if you have any doubts upon this question, ponder the case of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Prohibition. There is much to be said highly commendatory of Mr. Rockefeller. One of the richest men in the world, his modesty is unique, his life exemplary, his seriousness of purpose unquestionable, his sincere desire to be wisely useful to mankind unimpeachable. Mr. Rockefeller started his career under the handicap of a name upon which his father had placed a stain not all the oils of Pennsylvania could cleanse away; but the younger man has so lived and especially so administered his vast fortune as to challenge high respect. Yet never at any time, under any circumstances, has Mr. Rockefeller given the slightest indication of intellectual capacity or any power of public leadership. Divorce him from the millions of dollars with which his father dowered him, and he would sink at once into utter if wholly respectable obscurity. Yet it is this man whose letter to President Nicholas Murray Butler, announcing a change of opinion on the liquor question, was published in our newspapers like a presidential proclamation, and undoubtedly has had vast influence upon the minds of the people! Indeed, it is not too much to say that this one event has done much to transform the whole problem of Prohibition in this country. And it is money, not thought or even character, that "turned the trick"! If there is anything more disgusting than this, we do not chance to know what it is. What John D. Rockefeller, Jr., thinks upon any question seems to us a matter of entire unconcern. His opinions are not his own but always those of highly paid advisers who may or may not counsel him well. In this particular case he was badly advised, as his letter showed ignorance or gross misconception upon many phases of the Prohibition dilemma. What is true of Mr. Rockefeller is true also of Henry Ford, Andrew Mellon, and other millionaires whose empty or silly words are carried to the far ends of the earth, and accepted as the revelations of divine oracles, simply and solely because they are winged by money. The newspapers are of course largely responsible for this. Their worship of money is more completely abject and degrading than any idol-worship the world has ever known. But deeper down is our own materialism, which exalts money as the be-all and end-all of existence. And we pay for our sin when the rich man leads us.

The silence of the press on India, Soviet Russia, China, and Asia generally, is getting ominous. Everybody knows that events which posterity will count the most momentous of our time are taking place in these distant parts of the world. Yet there comes not a word from India, only a few casual and insignificant stories from Moscow, and a sudden cessation of what was for a time some admirable reporting in Manchuria, Shanghai, and Tokyo. Of course there may be excuse, as in India, where the British censorship is clamped down tight. In Russia, also, the censorship may well have been applied more rigorously since troop movements began in Siberia. In Tokyo, likewise, the government has undoubtedly watched despatches since the assassination of the late Premier. But where is the boasted enterprise of the traditional American journalist who laughs at locksmiths, jumps barriers, and defies censors? Can it be possible that the fourth estate is going to acquiesce in this situation, and be content with domestic news? To be sure, this latter commodity promises to be abundant, now that the presidential campaign is on, and with the Olympic games and other great sport events in the offing, to say nothing of the interminable Prohibition controversy. But fate is at work today not here in America, but, for the moment at least, far across continents and seas. The Indian revolution, affecting 325,000,000 of the world's people, the Chinese upheaval, involving over 400,000,000 other men and women, the Russian ferment stirring another 175,000,000, and all touching with the forces of life and death the very destinies of our western world—these are what we want to hear about. The wholly unexpected explosion of Europe in 1914 must stand forever as an indictment of a press which, charged with reporting facts and forces, left mankind entirely unprepared for the coming of this vast event. Let us not be left similarly unready for a similar explosion of Asia!

How much do Americans really believe in democracy and the people's will? Especially, what is the attitude of our American government toward any real movement of popular liberty? An answer to these questions is right at hand in the Chilean revolution. This, be it said, is no ordinary South American overturn. If it were, Washington would long since have

recognized the new administration at Santiago, and sent its hearty congratulations and good wishes. But there is something far deeper here than the fall of one military dictator and the rise of another. What we have in Chile is a genuine revolution—an uprising of an oppressed, poverty-stricken, miserable people, and the seizure of the state in their interest. From the very beginning, real things were done in this fierce movement of revolt. The president's palace was captured, of course—but also the banks! The political offices were taken over—and likewise the business offices. Roads and highways were policed—also railways, telegraphs and telephones. Ordinarily, in these South American countries, political puppets come and go, while the big banking and industrial interests, which are frequently dominated by foreign capital, remain securely in control of the nation's life. But now Chile has joined Mexico in the triumphant task of ousting the money-bags and enthroning the people—the real people, i. e., the workers. Revolutions used to be political, but in this age a merely political revolution is a sham. Economic forces are now in control the world around, and therefore any revolution, to be genuine, must be economic. Not royalty but capital is the enemy. Now in Chile, as yesterday in Mexico, real freedom has been won. Were we Americans ourselves free, we would be lifting flags and crowding house-tops in celebration of this victory. Our government, were it a truly democratic government, would have recognized the new workers' regime in Santiago within twenty-four hours, and declared a holiday in jubilation. But we are not glad over this great event—on the contrary, we are suspicious, and afraid. Alas—alack!

We clip from the *Christian Register* the following:

When the Disarmament Conference got down to business at Geneva, Litvinoff, the delegate from Soviet Russia, moved a resolution calling for total universal and rapid abolition of all armed forces. The other delegates looked at one another, wondering. Then—

Senor Madariaga, the Spanish delegate, stood up and said, quietly: "If M. Litvinoff will promise not to be angry I will tell you a fable told me by an Englishman."

This was the fable:

Once upon a Time the Animals of the Desert in Conclave discussed the Question of Disarmament. There were present the Lion, the Eagle, the Bull, the Tiger, and the Bear.

The Lion spoke first, and looking at the Eagle suggested the Abolition of Wings.

The Eagle, turning to the Bull, asked for the Suppression of Horns.

The Bull in his turn regarded the Tiger and demanded the Suppression of Claws.

It remained for the Bear to Speak, and he Suggested the Total Abolition of All Weapons so that He might Take them all into His Loving Embrace.

A shout of laughter broke from the delegates. Litvinoff himself was as helpless with merriment as anybody else.

The fun of this anecdote is obvious, but not so obvious its tragedy. For the essence of the Aesop-like story is not the final fling at Russia, but the whole parable of the Disarmament Conference itself. Read the latest despatches from Geneva, telling of the amiable agreement that armaments should be reduced to the lowest possible terms, and the equally amiable disagreement as to how, when, where, and why this reduction is to begin, and see how the fable fits. No proposal yet made has met with any favor except from the delegate making it in each particular case. Senor Madariaga's tale reveals the perfect truth—that each nation is willing, of course, to weaken the arms of his neighbor, but not under any circumstances willing to weaken his own arms. Why the Conference should continue its sessions longer, with such attitudes to contend with, is unaccountable—or would be unaccountable, if it were not for the fact that Geneva is a delightful city, the Swiss mountains are close at hand, and the League of Nations *entourage* is most charming. Yet how these delegates can enjoy life, even laugh at such a story as that told by the clever Spaniard, is more than we can understand. For the failure of the Conference means on the one hand the bankruptcy of Europe, and on the other hand an inevitable "next war." If we had our way, we would seize the delegates, lock them up in the dungeons of Chillon, put them on a diet of bread and water, give them no papers and pencils but only revolvers, rifles and machine-guns to play with, and not release them until they had agreed on a program for progressive, universal and complete disarmament. If these delegates were made to suffer themselves, instead of being asked to imagine the sufferings of the common people of the world, they might possibly do something.

A World Race

The science of anthropology—that is, the study of man in his total setting—is perhaps the most interesting and profitable of studies. In the consideration of a world race we are concerned, however, chiefly with physical anthropology which has to do with biological man, although the other divisions also contribute to our findings.

Despite the scientific certainty of the unity of the human race, there still persists the superstition of the superiority of certain races and the inferiority of others. The explosion of this superstition is pre-requisite to the building of world culture.

That there are differences in the cultural status of certain races at given times and that these differences are qualitative, none can deny; but it is a far leap from this commonplace observation to the conclusion that races as such are either superior or inferior. Cultural progress is never in a straight line.

There are all sorts of zigzags and overlappings. Differences in the achievements of races at given times are adequately accounted for on grounds other than inherent biological worth.

To begin with, the very standards that are used for purposes of measurement are the standards of the self-styled superior race, so we have the illogical situation where two races are both able to prove superiority by reference to their own standards, and of course a third race can easily, by the same process, prove its superiority over the other two.

The accident of power, resulting in turn from the accident of geographical position or perhaps invention, gives a feeling of superiority to the victorious race. The defeated race, on the other hand, develops a slave complex. Then the master complex and the slave complex are used as arguments for the superiority of the one and the inferiority of the other.

Cultural status, which is assumed to prove racial worth or the lack of it, is usually due to geographical location, climatic condition or natural resources. Examples are the early Mediterranean cultures and those of modern Europe where development was made possible by conditions that allowed for both the individuality of cultures and also their intermingling and exchange of goods and customs and ideas. The Aborigines of Australia, on the other hand, were cut off ages ago from the Continent of Asia, and so had no incentive from outside contacts. A good illustration of the effect of natural resources is the experience of the negro of Africa in passing directly from the Stone to the Iron Age, due to the presence in Africa of iron ore that smelts at a low temperature, whereas the European, because he could smelt copper easier than iron, passed from the Stone to the Bronze Age, and then to the Iron. This difference was not due to either inferiority or superiority but to natural resources.

Attempts have been made to prove the superiority or inferiority of races by size or weight of the brain. It has been argued that because, on the average, African peoples have smaller brains than European peoples, they are inferior mentally. Those who used this procedure neglected to note that Cro-Magnon man of twenty-five thousand years ago had a larger brain than modern man. Nor did they stress the fact that on the average the brains of men weigh more than those of women. Moreover, "average brain" is merely a figure of speech, not a reality. A considerable percentage of African brains weigh more than a considerable percentage of European or American brains, and there are many women who have brains heavier than those of many men. But the basic fallacy in this argument is the assumption that there is correlation between size of brain and mental capacity. The largest brain ever weighed was that of an epileptic idiot, and the smallest that of Gambetti.

The results thus far of intelligence tests do not support the theory of inherent racial inferiority or superiority. On the contrary, they show great differences within races, due to environmental conditions. The U. S. army mental tests are not to be taken too seriously, but for whatever they are worth, they show negroes of certain northern states rating higher in intelligence than whites of certain southern states. There is nothing surer than that, on the whole, mental tests register not inherent capacity but environmental opportunity. The idea of the inferiority or superiority of races, as such, is an exploded myth.

There is no biological reason why races should not intermingle, and the sociological objections are becoming fewer. In fact, from earliest times there has been the intermixture of races so that there is now no such thing as a pure race. The intermixture of races, on the whole, has been in proportion to their propinquity. With increasing association, due to modern conditions, this intermixture will grow greater, and the ultimate result will be a human race that will think of itself not in terms of pigmentation or other marks of differentiation, but in terms of the family man.

CURTIS W. REESE

Jottings

Karl Marx defined the modern state as "a Committee that looks after bourgeoisie interests." Look around the world today, and ask yourselves if Marx was right or wrong!

John J. Raskob bought the Democratic Party for a good price some years ago. But the Party went into bankruptcy in November, 1928, and now Raskob is being squeezed out, with all of his investment lost. But never mind! He won a lot in Radio!

A year or more ago, Police Commissioner Whalen declared that there were 32,000 speakeasies in New York. The Commissioner made no count or even survey, he simply made a guess. Now the Director of Prohibition, Colonel Woodcock, has taken an exact census, and he finds a total of 3,844 speakeasies in Manhattan. This would indicate not more than seven or eight thousand at the most for the entire city. Which gives us a fairly good illustration of the kind of statistics our "wet" friends handle!

The actual number of speakeasies in New York is all too large. But the total is far less than the

number of saloons, "blind tigers" and old-time speak-easies in the license days. And what can you expect, Prohibition or no Prohibition, in a city dominated by boozy politicians, corrupt police, and dripping "wet" newspapers?

A personal letter, just received from Mira, says:

"Though I was not permitted last Wednesday to see Bapu (Gandhi), I gather from Maniben and others who were permitted to see him that he is quite well and cheerful."—Dated, 22nd May, 1932.

"Jottings" takes an annual vacation each year of three months. So, this is Good-bye until the issue of UNITY for October 3rd next. J. H. H.

Miss Woolley, Einstein and Ponsonby

[From Our Special Correspondent]

I sat with the "press" while a few hours apart, but on the same day, Miss Woolley told us about the "news" from home—and Einstein and Ponsonby together gave us their opinion about the Conference, and what should be done.

MISS WOOLLEY first. She sat in Room 20 of the Hotel des Bergues, while her "class," as she called us, sat about her. There were twenty or thirty of us. She had before her letters, cables and petitions from America. Sunday was her red-day for cables, doubtless because in a "week-end message" more words could be sent for the money!

It was a revelation of the desires of the people, shown to her, their representative. It was "atmosphere" from New Orleans to Minneapolis, from Boston to Portland, where "rolls the Oregon." A lot of farm papers showed a keen interest in disarmament, because it might bring back prosperity. Hundreds of students in Berkeley asked to be saved from cynicism of government. Salem, Oregon, had just completed a six weeks' campaign of classes on disarmament, which resulted in hundreds of signatures being sent on. The ministers of Pasadena declared that disarmament must not fail. The International Club of North Dakota petitioned for drastic cutting of arms. A Service Star Legion demanded that "our descendants do not suffer." Olympia, Washington, "almost up in Canada," sent word "from just two common folks who wish for peace." The Brooklyn Federation of Churches, with 17,000 members, put itself on record for reduction of armaments. Oberlin College sent a petition with 502 names. A farmer's wife in Maryland, 200 Friends in Pasadena, Topeka Postal Clerks —all wished the success of the Conference.

Some young people in New Orleans sent word, "We have decided to have no more war. Can be better citizens. Hope you will succeed in making a safe world. We understand that the Conference is not making progress. Give 'em rotten eggs and popguns." Bishop McConnell cabled for the Federal Council of Churches, with twenty million members. In the office of J. J. Handsaker, Portland, eleven organizations joined in sending their desire for early action. The South is much alive. Many are specific in their proposals.

Miss Woolley intimated that the Delegation would be "almost ashamed to go home with nothing done." She also intimated that the Delegation was a "unit in wanting reduction" and that large numbers "at home" were asking for total disarmament, though generally as a goal, rather than immediate. Miss Woolley was very affable and square in her replies. I went away wondering what would happen, if now after four months, during which time the Conference had not come to the point of mentioning a single weapon that was considered "aggressive" to be consigned to the nether regions; after the technicians had been splitting hairs; after proposals were being made, like the following by the Spanish Delegation, in the Air Commission, that the "height of the ceiling of the aircraft, which has been correctly designed and constructed, is expressed by the following formula:

$$d = 3/b \text{ s } P2/G$$

where *d* is the ratio between the density of the air at sea level and at the height of the ceiling, *b* the lifting capacity of the aeroplane, *P* its power, *s* the wing surface and *G* the total weight."—after such discussions ad infinitum, in fine quality and huge quantity.

Suppose Miss Woolley were to declare to all the inhabitants in the United States what one of the ablest American newspaper men in the world has just written me, "I think that all talk about the limitation of armaments is the bunk" and said further that there was but one way to a solution of the armament problem, and that was abolition—the multitudes of America in the valleys and on the mountains would rejoice, as having found their New Freedom!

EINSTEIN AND PONSONBY.

These two men came to town in the morning and left on the evening trains. Ponsonby is a good fellow in spite of the handicap of being a "Lord" and Einstein as everybody knows is one of the Three Wise Men of mankind, in fact is such a good Christian that Dr. Fosdick gave him a permanent membership, in stone, in his fine "cathedral" on Riverside Drive. Einstein announced the 2 per cent idea in War Resistance. (For buttons, send to Arbitrator, 114 East Thirty-first street, New York City.) Ponsonby has a good peace record by writing some years ago (and getting a hundred thousand others to write) the Prime Minister, that in case of another war, he was to be counted out, absolutely.

They came down to Geneva on purpose to give their testimony on the problem of disarmament. There ought to have been a big public meeting with broadcasting, but their managers (things are managed here in closed committees) thought they knew better. They browsed around the League of Nations for a while, listened to the discussions of some of the technicians and met the "press" for a couple of hours. About forty were there with their pencils sharpened. Might have been better advertised—but the "good" always labor under the handicap of poverty!

Ponsonby said that the prospect of failure urged

all peace lovers to get up an interest. There was great power lying back in the masses, that was waiting for a bold proposal. He favored a plan of complete disarmament done in five years. Geneva seems to lead to involved language instead of simplicity. The number is increasing in all lands that will refuse to participate in war.

Einstein said that the efforts of the Conference were amusing if not so tragic. No method of technicians could abolish war. There must be first the will, character and intelligence. Whether moral disarmament should come first was like the question of the priority of the egg or the hen. Aside from the plan of total disarmament by all, the most practical measure would be for all to disarm down to the level of Germany. This would be a move in the right direction. He urged that women should urge men to refuse military service. . . . He said that disarmament was not the only question. Men must renounce supreme loyalty to their nations. There must be a new kind of society. He held that Labor should and would play a large part in the problem of disarmament. Here are three definite things that were urged: 1. Abolition of conscription. 2. Immediate cessation of recruiting and enlistment. 3. Immediate cessation of the manufacture of munitions and weapons of war.

They both believed that men were running a fatal race with time. Statesmen have a moral obligation to save the lads of today from the horrors of war. Complete and universal disarmament alone can ensure the world against war.

And while these two men were quietly giving their testimony for disarmament in Geneva, up at Zurich at the same hour the voice of Labor was speaking in convention debates and resolutions. The delegates were being urged to go back home and work for disarmament by example, "Not only must the workers resist war but if war came they should be prepared to take advantage of the situation it created to win power and establish Socialism."

That *"bold proposal"* mentioned by Ponsonby, that would arouse the masses—I have been turning the matter over in my mind, and I can honestly think of nothing that would come so near doing it—is not *reduction* and *limitation* (at mention of these words, the people yawn and turn over and go to sleep)—that *"bold proposal"* would be met by

General total disarmament now.

Geneva, Switzerland. SYDNEY STRONG.

Security and Armaments

*(1) Is There Security in Armaments?**

Disarmament is admittedly one of the most urgent and vital problems of the age.

It is recognized on all sides that another big war will shake civilization to its foundations, and either destroy it or completely change its form. By many the latter eventuality would not be deemed altogether undesirable, but what a price to pay for a transformation —however badly needed—of the social order!

If such a war occurs it will obviously be by virtue of the powerful armaments which exist in the world, thus proving that such armaments are the greatest possible menace to security, and surely that a supreme effort should be made to abolish them at the earliest possible moment.

If security lay in armaments the nations of the world would be more secure today than they have ever been, for between them they are spending something like £800,000,000 per year on the instruments of destruction. But that is not all. The destructive power of these armaments surpasses anything the world has hitherto known, even those used in the Great War and transcends that of former days as does the speed of the aeroplane that of the farmer's gig of the Victorian age.

Yet security has not been attained. All the nations alike confess it. Fear haunts them as never before. Fear has occupied the chief seat at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

Nevertheless the first impulse on a realization of insecurity on the part of all the nations, is to increase armaments. But the cost of modern armaments is so enormous that there is a limit to what nations can afford to spend. This fact, however, but increases the panic, especially at a time like the present when the economic situation is extremely difficult. Yet such is the state of fear among the nations that Governments are spending vast sums on armaments while scores of millions of people are without employment and are going short of the necessaries of life. The measure of the world's security may be gauged by the fact that while many nations are on the point of bankruptcy, and while few budgets are being balanced notwithstanding heavy cuts in expenditure, no cuts are being made in effective armaments. It is true that economies are being effected in the fighting services, as in Great Britain, but these economies affect pensions, barrack accommodation, etc., not fighting power. Such is the sense of insecurity today that nations will economize on anything rather than on armaments.

Not only that but each nation keeps a special watch on the military developments of its neighbors, and every improvement is counterbalanced by a better one. The finest inventive genius that can be procured is thus being devoted to the task of making more effective the instruments of death, to the task, that is, of destroying life rather than of glorifying and increasing it.

To this process there is no limit, as is proved by the fact that the fighting power of the world's armaments is four or five times greater than it was some ten years ago. The Under-Secretary for War stated in the House of Commons in 1929 that the fighting power of the world's armies had increased 100 per cent during the previous five or six years owing to increased mechanization. Armies have now mechanized infantries and cavalries as well as artillery. Then, of course, increased speed and gun power have characterized naval development, whilst a new arm, the seaplane, has been added. Couple with these considerations, the fact that the air force is to all intents and purposes a post-war development, and the truth of the above statement will be realized. As to reduc-

*This is the first of two articles by the Political Agent of the War Resisters' International of England. The second article will be in the next issue of UNITY.—Editor.

tions in military expenditure during recent years, this in fact has not been equal to the general fall in prices, which partly explains why the process of mechanization has been able to proceed without the public knowing much about it. Mechanization, moreover, enables fighting power to be increased while yet reducing manpower.

Yet this development of military power so far from diminishing fear has increased it. In their hearts Governments would like to disarm, and at last they agreed to meet in conference for that purpose. But their suspicion of each other is so deep seated that their representatives talk and talk and talk without daring to take one really effective step in the direction of disarmament. Thus the Geneva Conference spent several precious days in futile discussions over whether certain arms were defensive or aggressive, each nation maintaining that its favorite weapon was defensive, while those of its neighbors were aggressive. Thus Great Britain and the U. S. A. hold that battleships are defensive weapons and submarines aggressive, while France and several other countries hold that submarines are defensive and battleships aggressive.

The World Disarmament Conference has proved what every previous disarmament conference has proved, viz., that armaments stimulate fear, which increases as the power of armaments increases. That fear, moreover, is sufficiently strong to prevent any effective partial disarmament. Whatever decisions for limitation of armaments are reached, if they are not part of a scheme of total disarmament they will not be faithfully obeyed. When the issue in an armed conflict is practically extermination, it is folly to imagine that the next war is going to be controlled by a nice gentleman in white spats! Governments know that the next war will not be a cricket match, fought under the direction of an umpire, but a life and death struggle amidst unexampled terror and destruction. Consequently it is colossal self-deception even to attempt to limit effective armaments. The Disarmament Conference has proved beyond all question that there is no half-way house on the road to disarmament, that nations must either disarm completely or arm themselves to the teeth.

"But," says the advocate of limitation, "what about the battleship, was not the building of that costly weapon checked by the Washington Conference?" It was, but for what reason? For the primary reason that many naval experts believed that the big battleship is of no use in modern warfare. The aeroplane, the seaplane and the submarine have rendered it wellnigh impotent. Even in the last war the big battleships were eventually compelled to run into port and stop there. But since the Washington Conference naval engineers have so improved the 10,000 ton cruiser as to make it a far more effective weapon in modern warfare than the big battleship could possibly be. But no matter how many Conventions are passed prohibiting the use of poison gas in future wars, it can be taken for granted that every armed nation will have ample stocks of poison gas in readiness for the next holocaust.

Let us be under no delusion therefore. So long as armaments exist at all and nations accept the arbitrament of war, there can be no security, but fear will be rampant, and will prevent the faithful carrying out of any proposals for the limitation of armaments which may be agreed upon.

Considering, therefore, that in the next war both victor and vanquished will be brought to the verge of extermination, and that the utmost a nation can hope to achieve by means of arms is to inflict as much damage upon the enemy as it itself endures, it is incredible to find that governments do not realize that there is no security in armaments, and that the only hope of security is in total disarmament. But with this last point I will deal later on.

It is equally incredible that people who fully realize that the next war will mean virtual extermination for all who take part in it, should yet argue that powerful armaments are a preventive of war. They do not appear to realize that the very existence of the means of bringing about such a result will excite extraordinary fear, and in a time of crisis act as a powerful incentive to war.

For nothing jags the nerves like fear. Fear also beclouds the mind and makes rational decisions almost impossible. And as the power of armaments is growing from year to year we may depend upon it that the next war like the last war will commence from fear, fear that the enemy will get in the first blow. It is appalling to think that the fate of the whole world, of civilization itself, should be determined by the nerves of perhaps four or five people who cannot bear the strain of wondering if the enemy is going to get in the first blow. Such responsibility ought not to be placed upon any body of men, yet in an armed world it cannot be avoided.

What happened at the end of July, 1914, was that Russia, fearing Germany, mobilized, while Germany, fearing Russia, decided to strike first. Fear thus started the war—fear of the terrible consequences of being at a disadvantage at the start.

It will be the same in the next war, whether it starts in Manchuria between Japan and Russia, or where.

Indeed every armed nation is in the position of the airman whose plane had been hit, and who shouted to his pal as the three occupants of the machine came hurtling through the air: "Never mind, Bill, we've brought the Doctor with us!"

It follows from the above:

(1) That there is no security whatever in armaments.

(2) That the sense of insecurity grows as armaments become more powerful.

(3) That the limitation of armaments does not give security, but makes worse the position by encouraging dishonesty.

WILFRED WELLOCK

Enfield, England

Unharvested Wheat

Within the fields the ripened wheat . . .
Frozen toes on half-shod feet;
And famished forms upon a bed,
Starved to death for want of bread.

FANIA KRUGER.

Gandhi at the London Round Table Conference

Probably nowhere, unless in India, was Gandhi's visit to England in connection with the Second Round Table Conference watched with so great interest as in America. Several of the most important American papers reported his activities and his addresses in the Conference and elsewhere with remarkable fullness, and all papers, even in the smallest towns, gave him considerable space. The impression he made on the American public mind was generally favorable. While, in some quarters, much fun was made of his dress and his spinning wheel, he unquestionably won wide respect, not only for his highly religious character, but also for his undeniable intellectual ability and his able statesmanship. He probably did more to give to the American public a true understanding of India's great struggle for freedom and to create sympathy with it than previously had been done by any other half dozen agencies, perhaps more than by all others combined. There was a great desire for him to come to America. Many invitations were extended to him, and from the most influential sources. Among others was one from a "Committee of One Hundred" composed of as eminent and honored men and women as the country contains—distinguished authors and editors, presidents of universities, governors of states, United States senators, bishops and other prominent clergymen, widely known business men, and others. If he had come, he would have been shown great respect and honor everywhere, and undoubtedly his coming would have done still more to create sympathy with India's struggle to throw off her chains.

There are many indications that all this greatly troubled the British. They have a high regard for American public opinion, and of course desire its support in their dealings with India. As was to be expected, therefore, they did at the time, and have continued to do, much, through articles sent to our American papers and magazines, and through eminent Englishmen coming here to lecture in our universities and our great cities, to counteract these influences favorable to India and to win public opinion here to their side. Particularly have they wished to change our attitude toward Gandhi. They could not, of course, assail his character; I would be the last to claim that they have desired to do so. What they have done has been, not only to condemn in the strongest terms his non-cooperation movement in India, but to represent him as an obstructionist and an evil influence at the London Round Table Conference. To illustrate; on January 5th (1932), soon after the close of the Second London Conference (the one he attended), the British Government took pains to send out to the American people the following statement:

> Gandhi, at the Conference, was given every opportunity for assisting in the great task of working out a scheme of self-government for India. But from first to last, he made no practical contribution whatever to the work of the Conference.

In line with this, Mr. Gerald Campbell, British Consul General at New York, in a public address delivered March 7th spoke as follows:

> Mahatma Gandhi was as much a cause for the reported failure of the Round Table Conference as any other figure. He was the one man who made no constructive suggestions. He proved an unbelievable disappointment to those who genuinely wanted his cooperation.

Late in April, 1932, Lord Irwin visited Canada. While there he delivered an address (April 27th) upon the Indian situation, which was widely reported throughout the United States. In his address, he took pains to speak at considerable length of the London Round Table Conference and especially of Gandhi's influence there. While fully admitting the great Indian leader's high character, he criticized severely his attitude at the Conference, and condemned him as not a constructive statesman, because he did not favor the kind of constitution for India which the British there were working to frame.

These are illustrations of numberless similar statements made to the American public from almost every possible British source, aiming to disparage the statesmanship and the influence of Gandhi at the London Conference.

I do not cite these utterances of Englishmen as intentional misrepresentations of Mr. Gandhi on their part. I think they represent the real view of British imperialists generally. In other words, they show how far removed was Gandhi's idea of what the Conference ought to do, namely, prepare a constitution of freedom for India, from what he believed it really was doing, namely, preparing a constitution of prolonged bondage.

Of course, it was true that he did not offer any constructive suggestions for a constitution of *tyranny*. But if the Conference had been working, or if he could have induced it to work, to prepare for India a constitution of *Dominion Status*, or of *real self-rule*, then nobody could have called his ideas obstructive; instead, everybody would have recognized that they were constructive and valuable in the highest degree.

Lord Irwin seriously criticized Gandhi's conduct at the London Conference, and other Englishmen do the same, because as they say he would not "compromise." They ask, Why was he so rigid? Why did he not give up some of his demands, and meet us halfway? Why was he not conciliatory?

What are the real facts? The real facts are, that no man at the Round Table Conference was more conciliatory than he, or more willing to compromise on anything and everything except what meant, as he believed, the life or death of his country. What was the so-called compromise he was asked to make? It was to assist in framing a constitution for India based squarely on the monstrous idea that India has no rights of her own, no rights except such as are granted her by Great Britain, and the monstrous claim that Great Britain "owns" India, that India and the Indian people "belong" to her, are her "possession," "her Indian Empire," which therefore she has a right to manage as she pleases today and for all future time. Exactly that, and nothing less than that, was the "compromise," the "conciliatory" action, demanded of Gandhi.

In other words, it was a demand that he surrender all that was vital in India's struggle for freedom. It was a demand that he consent for India to remain a *subject people, a vassal people*, during the whole life of Britain's proposed Constitution, if not forever.

How did Gandhi answer?—as a traitor to his country? or as a patriot and a man of honor?

He dared to stand up before the highest officials of the British Empire, in their own capital city, and in a quiet, low voice, but with a firmness like Gibraltar,

declare in effect: India possesses rights of her own, conferred on her by God Almighty and not by any other nation, rights which no nation may take from her without committing a monstrous crime against God as well as against humanity. India does not belong to Great Britain or to any nation on earth. She belongs to the Indian people, and to them alone. No foreign nation has a right to rule her, much less frame a constitution for her. Were I, a son of India, to give my assent for you, a foreign power, to frame a constitution and force it on her, all India and all the world would be justified in pointing at me the finger of scorn, and hissing in my face the words, "You are a traitor to your country. You are India's Benedict Arnold."

Gandhi did not oppose in London, and has never opposed anywhere, any plan of Great Britain which he believed aimed to give India Dominion Status or real self-government in any form. With all his soul he wants Britain to give India self-government. For this he has been working with all his strength for many years. For this he worked in every possible way throughout the entire Round Table Conference. Courteously but unflinchingly, and over and over again, he said to the British officials at the Conference and to British officials outside the Conference, I oppose you because, and only because, in my carefully formed and profound judgment you are working to create and impose on the Indian people a constitution which they do not want, which they will accept only as it is forced on them, which will give them not real self-rule at all, not real freedom at all, not real Dominion Status at all, but a form of government which, while allowing them a few new privileges and liberties in relatively unimportant matters, keeps absolutely all power in British hands, and makes the "steel frame" of India's bondage actually firmer than ever.

It was no wonder that the British die-hards and all who were determined to keep India under British power, did not like Gandhi, denied that he was a constructive statesman and declared him an obstructionist. To them he *was* an obstructionist. His quiet but eloquent pleas for justice and freedom for the Indian people were a constant moral rebuke to the Conference for what it was doing, and a mighty moral call to its leaders to do something better, something just to India and honorable to Great Britain.

But while Gandhi was disliked, even bitterly disliked, by all persons at the Round Table Conference and in England who believed in giving India the "strong hand" instead of justice, he was warmly and deeply liked by all Englishmen who believe in freedom and justice to all men and all nations. Even many of the Lancashire people who were suffering worst from his boycott of British cotton goods, liked him, when, with sincere sympathy for their sufferings, he told them of India's far, far greater sufferings. The English poor liked him as a brother. How could they help it, when they knew that he was giving his very life for the poor in India, and when they saw him in England choosing to live among the poorest, rather than be entertained by the rich, when so many of the richest and most powerful would have counted it an honor to entertain him. The children liked him, yes, loved him, flocked about him, and followed in the streets, eager to catch a gentle word from his lips or a smile from his kindly eyes, for they saw in him one who seemed to them like Jesus.

On returning to India, he was almost at once arrested and committed to prison. One of his last acts was to request Mr. Elwin, a dear English missionary friend who was with him, to convey to all Englishmen the following message:

> Tell all your countrymen that I love them even as I love my own countrymen. I have never done anything toward them in hatred or in malice, and God willing, I shall never do anything in that manner in the future.

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

"The Praying Hands"

Until today "The Praying Hands" always recalled to me the noble old drawing by Albrecht Dürer,
So full of pathos, simplicity and spiritual appeal!—
With no face or even arms depicted, but only an aged peasant's uplifted hands, seen to the wrists;
The palms pressed together, and the gnarled fingers lightly laid against one another in childlike devotion.
But now the title means something new, and more disturbing to peaceful contemplation,
Something more poignantly the symbol of this later time of stress and peril in an age of machines.
For today as I was shown through a factory, my guide called attention to a box machine at which five girl operatives have had their hands mangled by the descending stamp.
Only yesterday, he declared, the last one to be injured had a finger so crushed and held that a mechanic had to remove ten bolts before it could be released from the steel jaws.
(One thinks how her hand must have looked like Christ's just after its unnailing.)
And now though this particular machine is not being used today, yet next to it another exactly like it is in operation,
And the hands of the girl tending it are slender and delicately-shaped, with fingers curving pliantly upward each time that they turn the work against the steel flange.
The beautiful members do not seem to tremble at all in their swift motions,
But each time before the fingers withdraw to escape the descent of the gnashing stamp,
They seem to kneel for a moment upon the exposed metal platform in silent agony of intercession.

So is my conception changed from the German artist's picture of "The Praying Hands."
And in place of the rugged, peaceful old fingers and joined palms uplifted in the safe seclusion of a shrine,
I see today filling all the foreground of remembrance and tormented imagination
Only a girl's brave fragile hands with fingers white as gardenia-petals, continually genuflecting on the naked shelf of a machine in a roaring factory,
As though beseeching the advent of a world where greed and cruelty shall no longer mangle the loveliest tender things of life.

ELIOT WHITE

The Study Table

Convicting the Innocent

"Innocent men are never convicted. Don't worry about it. . . . It is a physical impossibility." So a District Attorney in Worcester County, Massachusetts, is reported to have recently said. Would he say that again, I wonder, if he should read "Convicting the Innocent," by Prof. Edwin M. Borchard, of the Law School of Yale University?

This book* reports the cases of sixty-five persons who have been in prison for offenses against the law, some of them for very long terms, who on the discovery of further evidence were freed either by legal authorities or by the executive of the state or of the nation. The very first case reported is that of Herbert T. Andrews in the State of Massachusetts, a man of excellent character, who was sent to the House of Correction on the testimony of *seventeen* persons to whom he was alleged to have passed bad checks, to be released when such checks continued to be passed and the real criminal was discovered. The judge and the district attorney, be it said, made commendable haste in restoring Mr. Andrew's freedom when the wrong done him was discovered. Writing about the case later, the prosecuting attorney said: "As the two men stood at the bar I wondered how so many persons could have sworn that the innocent man was the one who had cashed the bad checks. The two men were as dissimilar as could be." Yet the inspector in arresting Mr. Andrews had said that he was absolutely sure, that he had never made a mistake in forty years!

Prof. Borchard in commenting on this case says: "For the suffering to which Mr. Andrews and his family were exposed, not to speak of the expense incurred in trying to prove himself innocent, no attempt was ever made to compensate him." The author rings the changes on this theme as he reports case after case.

Very similar is the case of Irving Greenwald, convicted in the State of New York on April 22, 1924, and freed from prison under very similar circumstances. In his case the prosecuting attorney had said that the evidence was "case-iron, brass-bound, copper-riveted and air-tight," and the judge had given the defendant the extremest sentence allowed because of his obstinacy in maintaining his innocence. Yet when the two men, the wrongly sentenced and the criminal were stood together, the only similarity was that they both of them had blue eyes and blond hair! In every other feature they were dissimilar.

Twenty-nine of the wrongly judged cases were found guilty of murder—in eight of which the supposed victim later turned up alive! One murder case, that for which Andrew Toth was convicted, has become a *cause célèbre*. He was identified by *one* witness as having killed a furnace boss with a shovel during a riot in a steel mill in Braddock, Pennsylvania. There was much dissatisfaction with the sentence among the better element in the community, and it was commuted to life imprisonment. He was a model prisoner and earned the soubriquet of "Praying Andy." Finally came the news from Hungary that a man named Steve Toth, on his supposed death bed, had made confession before a judicial authority that it had been he and not Andrew Toth, of the same name but no relation, who had killed Quinn. The case was reopened in Pennsylvania, and the brother of the lawyer who had been in charge of his case succeeded in completely freeing Andrew Toth from his charge of guilt. But he had then been in prison for twenty years! A movement was at once started to have $10,000 granted him by the state, for the twenty years of his life which it had taken from him; clergymen and editors joined in urging this bill, without avail. Then Andrew Carnegie in whose mill the labor riot had occurred, gave him a pension of $40.00 a month.

Another man, convicted of murder on the evidence of *one* witness, was Will Purvis, of Mississippi, a lad of nineteen, who was literally hanged in the presence of a great crowd who had come from all the country round as to a gala day. The rope was adjusted and the trap sprung, but the knot had been wrongly adjusted, and when Purvis started to mount the gallows a second time, the crowd cried out for mercy. The sheriff was in a quandary and felt unwilling to proceed in the face of a hostile crowd. Finally the case was commuted. Then the star witness stated that he might have made a mistake in identifying Purvis! Later the bottom fell altogether out of the case and he was set free. He married a childhood sweetheart, the daughter of a minister, and seven children played round his door. He was a prosperous farmer. Twenty-seven years from the date of the crime, $5,000 was granted to him by the legislature on the ground that "the State of Mississippi has confessed to a great wrong done you, and now removes all stain and dishonor from your name."

Equally close to the gallows came J. B. Brown of Florida. With the rope round his neck, he was temporarily reprieved when the warrant was read and the name of the foreman of the jury was found in place of his own! A plea for commutation of the sentence to life imprisonment was finally granted. Twelve years later a man who had been jointly indicted with Brown, and then nol-prossed, confessed on his deathbed that he alone was guilty. Careful checking corroborated the confession and Brown, on the recommendation of the trial judge and of the prosecuting attorney, was granted a full pardon. When he was "aged, infirm and destitute," in consideration of what was called "faithful service . . . during the period of wrongful imprisonment," the Legislature appropriated $2,492 for his relief, to be paid in monthly installments of $25.00 a month.

It may be said that this book presents little that is new or important. It is self-evident that innocent persons may be sometimes wrongly convicted—that the law is but a human instrument which no one claims to be infallible. That is the comment I have seen in one complacent journal.

But Professor Borchard's comment on the sixty-five cases which he has collected is in sharp contrast with this comfortable opinion. He believes that these cases which have come to his knowledge from stray sources are but indications that a large residuum remains which has not come to light. Consider the three men whose cases were cited above who were commuted from being hanged. Will Purvis was discovered to be innocent after two years imprisonment; B. J. Brown after dying inch by inch in prison for twelve

*"Convicting the Innocent," by Edwin M. Borchard. Published by the Yale University Press. Price $3.75.

years; and Andrew Toth after he had been in prison for twenty years. The first two of these men escaped hanging at the very last minute and by circumstances so extraordinary as to be out of the running. These men were finally rescued from prison by a confession which led to the whole tissue which had made for their conviction being undone, in the first case through the activity of an official prominent in the hanging which had miscarried, in the second case through the recommendation of the trial judge and the prosecuting attorney and in the third case through the disinterestedness of the brother of the attorney who had defended the accused in a fiercely contested labor controversy twenty years before. It was the confession of one false witness in each case which led to the undoing of a great wrong, plus the active interest of persons who ordinarily are not active in searching out a possible error.

Many of us remember that there was a confession in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, which their counsel implored the judge and the prosecuting attorneys to sift with him and to which they turned a deaf ear, even to the extent of opposing by every means in their power the presentation of the case at the hearing, which convinced many who followed it that a case demanding a new trial had been more than made out. Thinking of these things, one wonders how many confessions have never reached a hospitable ear.

Whether the unrighted wrongs have been few or many, the narrow chances on which convictions are secured are amply demonstrated by this book. There is the testimony of witnesses of the crime who saw the deed done and who are persuaded that they recognize the criminal. In eight of the cases which Prof. Borchard reports, no slightest resemblance was found between the real criminal when he was found and the falsely accused, and in twelve other such cases the resemblance was very slight. In only two cases was there a resemblance at all close.

Prosecutors know the very slight value of such testimony, yet they likewise know that it is enormously telling with a jury, and where their personal promotion is forwarded by their success in convicting for crime, it is a forlorn hope to expect them to warn juries against the evidence which they present, and to work only for justice. And here comes in the value of a reform for which Prof. Borchard argues again and again—namely, that the community should make compensation to an innocent person convicted of crime. If the possible expense to the community of this reform is plead, may it not be answered, says Prof. Borchard, that it may work like accident compensation where the cost of an accident to the employer very frequently prevents the accident from happening. Many of the cases cited in this book go to prove this thesis. To take just one—that of John A. Johnson, convicted of a murder on his own confession, but under the manipulations of a Burns detective agent that only by signing the confession which he had prepared could the accused escape being torn to pieces by a mob. The least reflection by the judge or by the prosecuting authorities would have shown that the confession described an impossibility. But no; the whole community was inflamed; all that was wanted was a victim; the fact that the community must pay, if its lust for blood was not controlled, was never suggested. Thus an innocent man passed ten years in prison before he could get his plea heard by one who made a thorough investigation, showed up the facts, and secured his pardon from the Governor. Johnson was entitled to compensation because the crime occurred in Wisconsin where there is a statute granting compensation, but he failed to get it because the state board which administers it decided that he was at fault in having signed a false confession. No fault seems to have been found with the detective who had tormented him into making his confession!

Other methods of preventing false convictions urged by Prof. Borchard are, public defenders to be supplied with funds to prepare a case—the pitifully inadequate defense of many of those wrongly convicted speaks for itself; also, publicly employed state experts are recommended who have no more interest than a judge has in their findings. It is interesting to note in reading these cases that Captain William H. Proctor of the Massachusetts State Police who acted as a "framed" witness against Sacco and Vanzetti, and likewise Albert H. Hamilton who testified in their defense, both testified for the government in cases which Prof. Borchard reports, and both of them testified wrongly. Further, Prof. Borchard recommends the organization, when there is grave suspicion of error, of an independent investigating committee which should look up controversial facts. Of course, none of these reforms would absolutely prevent the conviction of the innocent, but they would have gone very far toward protecting many of the persons whose cases are recorded in this book.

In a final chapter Prof. Borchard reviews the legislation enacted in Europe and on our own continent where indemnity is provided for persons wrongly convicted of crime. It was a surprise to me to learn that the agitation seems to have begun in Germany as far back as 1832, where however, it was not adopted until 1898. But meanwhile and since, the principle has been accepted in the middle of the last century in the cantons of Switzerland whence so many of our reforms have come, in Sweden, Norway and Denmark in 1886, 1887, and 1888, and later still in Austria, in France, in Belgium, in Spain, in Portugal, in Poland, in Holland, in Brazil, in Chile, in Argentina, in Mexico, and in California, North Dakota and Wisconsin. In our own states the statutes have been imperfectly drawn and narrowly interpreted as was seen in the Johnson case, and the statutes in other countries vary in every degree. These are examined and a draft statute is suggested which might serve as a model for legislation in the United States. Also Prof. Borchard urges that compensation, when it is given, should be as of right and not as a favor as in the cases of Will Purvis and J. B. Brown, and others.

Strongly urged by Prof. Borchard is the establishment of an appellate court in every state in our own land and in the federal government, which is free to review the evidence as well as the law, certainly in capital cases and possibly in cases of felony. It was a shock which readers of UNITY are not likely to forget in the Sacco-Vanzetti case when it at last reached the Superior Court of Massachusetts on its request for a new trial, that they were told:

> It is not imperative that a new trial be granted even though the evidence is newly discovered and if presented to a jury would justify a different verdict.

One trial in a heated atmosphere before one intensely prejudiced judge and jury and *six hearings before the*

same judge on a mass of newly discovered evidence, always answered "Nothing new here," leaves Massachusetts justice heavily in default. This reform came in England and then in Scotland as a result of erroneous injustices; it has since been enacted in New York and New Jersey in our own land. It was recommended in Massachusetts by the Governor and by the Judicial Council in 1928, after Sacco and Vanzetti had gone to their doom. Speed the day when this reform, a dictate it would seem of simple common sense, will prevail throughout the civilized world.

"Convicting the Innocent" is a book which should be widely read. It is expensive, and thus every community should urge its public library or its book club to buy it, so that its contents may reach a large public.

ELIZABETH GLENDOWER EVANS

Philippine Uncertainty

Senator Hawes of Missouri has been a vigorous and consistent supporter of Philippine independence. Because that question was sure to come before the present Congress and because of certain claims made by the opposition, he decided to visit the Philippines and see for himself the condition and sentiment of the Filipinos. The book before us is a result of that visit.* Whether the people of the islands really desire independence can no longer be a question. The reception given the senator was a veritable ovation. It could not have been engineered by a handful of politicians to impress the visitor. It was spontaneous, widespread, enthusiastic. If any really significant section of the Filipinos were opposed to national independence, their sentiment could not have been suppressed or concealed. Of course the greatest crowd that greeted him was in Manila, but everywhere there were astonishing numbers. In Manila the number was reported at 250,000 persons. The attitude of the people is correctly stated by Senator Osmeña in the words: "We may be divided on internal questions, but all of us are united in our demand for independence." Our author briefly states how the Philippines came into our hands. He describes the independence struggle against Spain which was destined to succeed, even if we had never gone to the islands. He narrates the events which led to our becoming the allies of the Filipinos, who believed we were helping them to gain their freedom. He describes the Philippine Republic, which was fully organized and functioning, until we precipitated a war against our allies and destroyed the first Christian Republic of Asia. He lays bare the false and lying propaganda carried on from Manila and supported by business and financial interests which desire our retention of the islands. He studies the development of commerce and enterprises and shows that the uncertainty in regard to future status prevents the advance that might be expected. It is this phase of the situation that gives the title to the book. It is unfair alike to the Filipinos and the foreign interests that this uncertainty should continue. A definite conclusion as to the future status of the islands is urgently demanded. Senator Hawes' own opinion is that complete independence should be granted as soon as possible. Certain claims and objections are met. The much emphasized diversity of language is shown to be no bar to independence. Here, incidentally, your reviewer was interested in the opinion that the English language has no great part in the future. As a lone voice crying in the wilderness, he has long claimed that three languages would share the field—a native tongue (a modified Tagalog probably), Spanish and English, in decreasing importance in the order named. The claim that there is an irreparable cleavage between *Cristiano* and *Moro* is shown to be false. What hostility exists has been sedulously cultivated and over-exploited by the opponents. Left to themselves the Cristiano and Moro will get on well enough. Our author considers the claim that prominent leaders of the Filipinos in reality do not want independence and secretly are working against it, to be false. I do not find it so easily met. If they *have* been bribed and hired to work quietly against independence, they have found the popular demand too strong to be resisted. Not the least important and interesting part of the book is found in the appendices. Here we find the text of a good-will speech given by the senator before the Philippine Senate in full session, and a letter from Emilio Aguinaldo, who was President of the Philippine Republic and Commander-in-Chief of its forces, our allies against whom we waged a long and expensive war. Aguinaldo, from the time of his surrender onward, has submitted to the situation and has refrained from any hostility, secret or open, toward the United States. Through the years he has been silent. The fact that he has recently been outspoken in favor of independence is suggestive and important. Philippine Independence is near. If later Congresses revoke or modify the recent action, it will make little difference in the final outcome. How sad it is that our action has been based upon selfish and narrow interests. How proud we would justly be if it had been truly magnanimous, based upon the recognition of justice and right.

FREDERICK STARR

*"Philippine Uncertainty: An American Problem." H. B. Hawes. New York. 1932. The Century Co. 16 mo. pp. xvii. 360. Price $3.00.

Correspondence

Depression or Expression

Editor of UNITY:

When a springtime plant pushes up through the earth it often cracks and lifts the ground around it. This may make the grass on the broken earth wither and die. But the glory of the new life easily compensates for the loss. So, is not the present "Depression" in some of its aspects but the *Expression* of a new life breaking up through the world's crust?

There is a new world of interdependence and fellowship. The nationalistic crust is breaking up. Trade and travel have long expressed international interests but blind people have piled up tariffs and passports. They have helped make the depression, but now do not understand! They shake their heads helplessly moaning, "We never saw it like this before." They do not seem aware of the new plant pushing upward; they see only the fading away of many of their business enterprises and ideas.

But why should those who do have eyes to see miss the joy of early springtime? Our financial losses are indeed real. The lack of a chance to work is terrible and degrading. But we can bear it all happily if we see that it is the beginning of a new era when no one will have to work all his day-long to earn his food and comfort. When each one shall have time and incentive to give of his own individual treasures.

Necessity itself will bring new life plans for everybody. Necessity is the mother—of a new world order! Self-preservation is leading to co-operative methods. That old saying of Franklin's now has a new application—"Gen-

tlemen, we must all hang together or we will hang separately." We are hanging separately now—we must get together. This desperate fact brought about, for instance, the thrilling story of Chadburn's organization of the seven big sugar exporters into the "International Sugar Council." They kicked like steers at the idea of "outside" meddling with their affairs. But finally the patient diplomacy led them to see that there is no "outside" and that unless they *planned together* they would conduct the sugar business in a suicidal manner, not even paying the cost of production. Their organization is still having its ups and downs and is yet to be tested by its service to all the people. It is, however, a definite sign of the new co-operation which must reach into many fields.

Why should we not form a Cheer-up Club through the Editor of UNITY and pass on to each other good news of the coming co-operative commonwealth?

In strange, unexpected places the good news will appear and must be appraised for what it may be worth. But are not all encouraging signs worth noting now? Here are a few:

A conservative lawyer a few days ago told some of his shoe manufacturing clients—"The only thing for you to do is to *combine* for low rates to the buyer in order that he may buy from you!"

An artist pointed out to a group of Boston writers that they must turn their attention to the working man who is rapidly coming forward asking for a share in all phases of culture.

A playwright, recently, at a luncheon of professional people said that the theatre can flourish only by the patronage of groups, since there would soon be no millionaires to support it!

A politician speaking before a large political group said, "This is too serious a time to talk election bunk. We have all got to *put our heads together* and find a way out on the principle of brotherhood."

An ex-premier of Canada has proposed a plan of "joint action" in industry to make it succeed for the people.

The two warring nations, Japan and China, have signed a peace treaty which is a victory for the peaceful "non-recognition plan" and also for the League of Nations.

French elections show signs of movement away from militarism and toward co-operation with other nations for disarmament.

All these and many more items of news, with names and dates, might easily be gathered showing the coming of the new World Fellowship. Is there not enough good to make us lift up our heads and reach forth our hands to help? In the midst of darkness there is light. "The live seed lifts its earth-load and is free."

ELEANOR WOOD WHITMAN.

Quincy, Massachusetts.

A Noble Southern School in Extremis

Editor of UNITY:

We wish in this brief word to ask attention to a group of children who are being turned away from the only school in their little community because adequate help to save the situation has been lacking. For twenty-eight years a heroic teacher, trained in a school that was an outgrowth of Booker Washington's Tuskegee, has been leavening the darkness of ignorance in a community of colored people in the black belt of Alabama.

Today, in bitterness of spirit in the present economic depression, he writes from this school, the Street School of Minter, Ala., that unless help from outside comes, he must not only dismiss his teachers, who have received only half of their meager salary, and must let the insurance lapse on his wooden buildings; he must even close the school, so highly valued by both white and colored neighbors. This involves not only a question of book learning but of subsistence; for where farming, household management and the canning of vegetables are taught, a means of livelihood is in great part jeopardized.

We have known the school for many years, and we have visited it. Mr. Brown, the principal, is the finest type of man, absolutely unselfish and devoted to the interests of his people. We feel that the cessation of its beneficent work should not be permitted. Dr. John Haynes Holmes and Rev. Edwin Fairley of the New York trustees have visited it and written of it in the highest terms. Professor Edwin H. Hall of Cambridge has been one of its generous helpers. We shall be glad to give any information if desired; and contributions may be sent to Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, 19 Euston Street, Brookline, Mass., and will be gratefully acknowledged.

KATHERINE HOMANS,
ANNIE F. BROWN,
LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston, Massachusetts.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 258)

few. Besides, American women were not merely thinking of their own rights—but of the disgrace of allowing injustice to women to be written into the first article of the International Code of Law. To avoid this false step they are willing to use the opportunity of American entry into the World Court, and back up their demands with their votes.

Swanson claimed that the Senators who favored the women's amendment were enemies of the World Court, anyhow, and wanted to delay our entry. He said: "No real man will give way to your wishes just to be popular. I've got to stand firm. I'm an obstinate fellow with glue on my feet. You wouldn't choose a man who had soap on the soles of his shoes, would you?"

The women said they favored the World Court, too, but they thought justice to women was worth a few years' delay, if necessary. They expected no delay. The rest of the world is so anxious to have the United States join that foreign governments will promptly drop consideration of the unfair Hague Convention. In this way American women can help all the other women, and bring nearer the day of actual equality and justice.

Senator Swanson ended the interview by begging for women's help to get the United States into the World Court. They promised to help him on condition he would help them. On the whole it was plain that to the kind and courteous Senator from Virginia the question of women's nationality of rights is unimportant.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL WOMEN'S PARTY OF U. S. A.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Peace Heroes' Memorial

[NOTE: Ten years ago the Peace Heroes Memorial Society of Cincinnati, Ohio, inaugurated the solemn practise of decorating on Memorial Day the graves of peace heroes—a policeman, a fireman, a railroad worker, and a factory worker who lost their lives in the discharge of their duties, and of a woman who died in childbirth.—UNITY has each year celebrated this event as an example for other American communities. The address given at this year's ceremony is presented herewith.—EDITOR.]

Memorial Day is a solemn and a heart-stirring occasion. It appeals strongly to our nobler nature, to those loftier ideals of patriotism which give expression to our realization of the solidarity of our nationalism, to our appreciation of the achievements of our illustrious dead, and to our gratitude toward the heroes who have preserved the liberties and the institutions of our beloved country. Today, throughout the length and breadth of this land, in small hamlet and huge metropolis, our citizenry has assembled to honor, and to pay tribute to, the soldiers and sailors of the Star-Spangled Banner, who having gone to rest at the final taps on earth, have arisen in the Eden of Eternity, to the joyous reveille of immortality. There goes up a mighty chorus of praise for bravery and self-sacrifice, for heroism and for patriotism; for the soldiers of the battlefield; for the soldiers of the sea and the depths of the sea; for the soldiers of the trackless and treacherous air. We join in that chorus; and no voices are more sincere than ours. Memorial Day is as dear to us as to any element of the population. Verily, it is so sacred to us that we would intensify its influence and expand its significance. Without abstracting one iota from the laudation of our military and naval champions, we would ask a hearing for the claims to recognition for the services of the "unwept, unhonored and unsung" heroes of the times of peace. "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war"; and to those who win, or contribute

to those victories should be paid the tributes of recognition, gratitude and praise.

We submit that the final end of war, as of every other social activity of a nation or a group of people, is the moral and material progress of the body politic; and we contend that moral and material progress finds its most favorable habitat only in the paths of peace. Never, we venture to say, has the world witnessed stronger confirmation of this contention than the present deplorable condition of all the nations of the earth. The entire globe is submerged in a sea of discontent, fear, want, idleness and suffering, because of the aftermath of the Great War; because the threat of international conflict is in the air; because, although more than a decade has passed since the close of the Peace Conference, there is no real peace of mutual trust and helpfulness, of contentment, of hope, of friendly emulation in promoting the common good of mankind.

It is, then, not to be wondered at that we should ask consideration, on this auspicious occasion, for the heroes of peace, for the social welfare workers who have learned the luxury of doing good; for the physicians and chemists whose researches in the healing art have discovered and defeated the causes of disease; for the nurses who brave the contagium of plague and pestilence; for the men who go down to the sea in ships; for the miners who dare the dark and the dangers of the bowels of the earth; for the explorers and the engineers; for the scientists, and for the host of "unknowns" who have no national shrine to glorify their accomplishments; for the mothers who go down into the Valley of the Shadow; for the ministers of God who bring to the sin-sodden soul "the peace of God that passeth all understanding"; for the common man who, according to his lights and his ability, strives to be brother to his neighbor and to make his community a better and a happier place of abode.

It is to these neglected heroes of peace that we call attention today, with the same admiration and veneration which we pay to our soldiers. They are exemplars of charity, the greatest of all virtues, the antidote to racial and religious animosity, the holy oil which stills all threatening storms on the sea of social life.

Did it ever occur to you, my friends, that charity is the only virtue that will endure throughout all eternity? Yes! Charity, love of God and of neighbor, is everlasting with the eternity of God Himself. After death, faith shall be no more; for, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality," we shall see and know what now we only believe. Hope, too, shall pass away; for, beyond the grave, we shall possess and enjoy all that can fill the heart of man. Charity, charity alone, shall pass through the ordeal of death and come forth purified, magnified and strengthened beyond all earthly measure, when the beating of time shall yield to the throbbing of eternity as it pulsates in the divine heart of God and finds its perfect echo in the myriad hearts of man.

THOMAS P. HART, M.D., Ph.D.,
Editor of the *Catholic Telegraph*,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Memorial Day Service

Webster Groves, Mo.

"Decoration Day" with its popular connotation of gayety and merrymaking is a thing of the past. Memorial Day with an undercurrent of somber and serious reflection has taken its place. That is as it should be, as it was meant to be originally. Our service today is dedicated to the memory of all who have given themselves in generous and heroic service to the welfare of humanity.

—Evangelical Church Bulletins.

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions.

If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE

Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry

of Sir Walter Scott

With a Critical Introduction,

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press

114 Fifth Avenue New York City

The May-June issue of

The New Humanist

Containing:

OF THEE I SING
by Frank Lloyd Wright

TWO SONNETS
by Hugh Robert Orr

DOCTRINAL FUNCTIONS AND RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES
By Cassius J. Keyser

A NEW MIDWESTERN FRONTIERSMAN
by E. T. Knower

A STUDENT OF DILTHEY
by Hans-Joachim Schoeps

TRAGIC AMERICA
by Carl Henry Grabo

SPECIAL OFFER

The New Humanist ($1.00 *yearly;* 20c *a copy*) *will be sent in combination with any of the following books at reduced prices* (*regular price of book in brackets*) *The New Humanist for one year*

With: Sir James Jeans "The Mysterious Universe" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: Norman Thomas, "As I See It" ($2.00) $2.50
With Twenty-two Authors "Living Philosophies" ($2.50)—$2.75
With: Curtis Reese "Humanist Religion" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: A. E. Haydon "The Quest of the Ages" ($2.50)—$2.00
With: Walter Lippmann "A Preface to Morals" ($1.00)—$1.65

If book you want is not listed here, send for prices. Please send check or money order, otherwise books will be mailed C. O. D. All orders must be placed with

THE NEW HUMANIST

14 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio